



Minutes – City Planning Commission

1,886th Meeting

6:00 P.M. June 9, 2005
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL
3900 MAIN STREET

**MINUTES APPROVED AS PRESENTED
AT THE NOVEMBER 3, 2005 MEETING**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Brown, Comer, Kurani, Densmore, Leonard, Maloney, Norton,
Singletary,

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

STAFF PRESENT: Gutierrez, Planning Director
Aaron, Principal Planner
Jenkins, Senior Planner
Brenes, Associate Planner
Milosevic, Associate Planner
Smith, Deputy City Attorney
Andrade, Stenographer

THE FOLLOWING BUSINESS WAS CONDUCTED:

Chair Leonard reconvened the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

H. PUBLIC HEARING - 6:00 p.m.....	4
20. PLANNING CASE P04-0178: Planning Commission review of the General Plan 2025 Program and related Final Program Environmental Impact Report (SCH NO. 2004021108). The General Plan 2025 Program consists of the following components: 1) the City of Riverside General Plan 2025; 2) the comprehensive revision of the City of Riverside Zoning Code (Title 19 of the Municipal Code) and the rezoning of properties to reflect new zone names; 3) the comprehensive revision of the City of Riverside Subdivision Code (Title 18 of the Municipal Code); 4) the Citywide Design Guidelines; and 5) the Implementation Plan.	4
Land Use & Urban Design Element	4
Item 11 - Area X	4
Item 10 – Area O, 4006, 4020, 4032, 4046 & 4060 Maplewood Pl.	5
Item 10 – Area Q.....	6
Item 10 – Area R.....	8
Item 10 – Area U, 1145 Everton Pl.....	10
Item 10 – Area V.....	10
Item 11 – Area W.....	10
Item 11 – Site Y	11
Item 11 – Site Z.....	11
Item 11 – Area AA.....	12
Item 11 – Area AAA, 3735 & 3739 Nelson Street and 6781 & 6789 Brockton Avenue.....	13
Item 12	13
Item 13	13
Item 14	14
Item 15	14
Item 16	14
Item 17	15
Circulation and Community Mobility Element	16
Item 18-26.....	16
Housing Element.....	19
Item 27	19
Arts & Culture Element	20
Item 30-31	20
Education Element	21
Item 33	21
Public Safety Element.....	21
Item 34-35	21
Noise Element.....	22
Item 36-37	22
Air Quality Element.....	23
Items 38-39	23
Open Space and Conservation Element.....	24
Items 40-42	24
Public Facilities and Infrastructure Element.....	24
Items 43-45	24
Park and Recreation Element.....	24
Items 46-48	24

Historic Preservation Element	27
Glossary	27
Item 49	27
Additional Items.....	27
Items 50-52	27
Figure O - Comment Letters	32
Land Use & Urban Design Element	33
Items 2-9	33
Public Comments	33
I. ADJOURNMENT.....	34

H. PUBLIC HEARING - 6:00 p.m.

20. PLANNING CASE P04-0178: Planning Commission review of the General Plan 2025 Program and related Final Program Environmental Impact Report (SCH NO. 2004021108). The General Plan 2025 Program consists of the following components: 1) the City of Riverside General Plan 2025; 2) the comprehensive revision of the City of Riverside Zoning Code (Title 19 of the Municipal Code) and the rezoning of properties to reflect new zone names; 3) the comprehensive revision of the City of Riverside Subdivision Code (Title 18 of the Municipal Code); 4) the Citywide Design Guidelines; and 5) the Implementation Plan.

Chair Leonard announced that the Commission would continue where they left off at the last meeting. The Commission is in a closed hearing session and will be acting on individual site requests and policies that Planning staff has recommended. The Commission finished Areas A-N and will continue with Area O.

Commissioner Brown requested to skip to Area X and then continue with Area O. He stated that Site X appears to be related to M and N.

Land Use & Urban Design Element

Item 11 - Area X

Chair Leonard noted that there was no objection and the Commission proceeded with Area X. This is an individual request by Rizzco Automotive.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Singletary, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Norton, **TO DENY** staff's recommendation for Area X as outlined in the staff report and apply the I-Industrial Zone.

Commissioner Densmore noted that the primary testimony in this area has been from Rizzco Automotive. He pointed out that there are some residences in the area and asked if the Commission if they would consider a less intensive zoning for those residents in the area. They are only considering the I Zone to accommodate one property owner. He was concerned about expanding the I Zone for a property owner that may not fit with the surrounding uses.

Commissioner Singletary said that the majority of the area is going toward an industrial use. He recommended that the entire Area X should be I-Industrial Zone.

Commissioner Norton said she did not view it as just one applicant. She indicated that there is a huge auto auction and she would lean in favor of the entire Area X as Industrial.

Chair Leonard said he was struggling with the fact that there is an island of Industrial with a mixture of lighter business and heavier uses but that they all seem to be tied together. He wondered if they shouldn't be looking at a larger or smaller area. He indicated that it isn't appropriate to look only at that individual property given the boundaries of Area X. He stated that the property should be Business Office Park, or a larger area should be designated as Industrial.

Commissioner Singletary stated that his comment last week had been to roll Area X into Area M. There is quite a bit of business on Fremont that goes toward the auction. Fremont Street is a good boundary going southwest. This area should have been in Area M. He understood what the commission was saying as far as a bigger area but still felt that this area made sense as Industrial.

Chair Leonard stated that he did not recall hearing testimony on the leg extending further down Jurupa Avenue in terms of any preference. He suggested that the parcels bounded by streets be designated as I-Industrial.

Commissioner Singletary stated he did not have a problem with this.

Commissioners Comer and Kurani arrived at this time.

Commissioner Maloney asked if the east side of Fremont was residential. He stated that residential and Industrial would not be a good mix. He asked if it would be possible for the properties that face Jurupa to be the Industrial areas. He has been down Fremont several times and is familiar with the area. He asked whether there were any current examples of residential and business mixes in the area.

Diane Jenkins, Sr. Planner, replied that there is a mixture. There are businesses and residential uses still intertwined there.

Chair Leonard noted this was a little mystery to him as well. He was in the area over the weekend. The areas in grey are all automotive related businesses and the areas in blue are residential.

Commissioner Norton noted that the grey area on the exhibit is already M-1 and that the blue areas are MP and felt that this furthered the argument for the I-Industrial.

Commissioner Singletary reiterated that he still felt that Area X as noted should be I-Industrial.

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 7 ayes to 1 no and 0 disqualified and 0 abstentions.

AYES:	Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Norton, Singletary,
NOES:	Maloney
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	None
ABSENT:	Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Item 10 – Area O, 4006, 4020, 4032, 4046 & 4060 Maplewood Pl.

Chair Leonard read staff's recommendation.

Ms. Jenkins reported that this was part of the Citizen's Advisory Committee, site 20 and these five residential lots, facing Maplewood, were accidentally included in this site. They were included in the Mixed-Use Neighborhood by mistake and staff is now recommending that they go back to the Medium Density designation.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Comer, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Norton, **TO APPROVE** staff's recommendation for Area O as outlined in the staff report.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Maloney, Norton, Singletary,
NOES: None
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Item 10 – Area P

Chair Leonard read the proposal for Areas P-1, P-2, and P-3.

Ms. Jenkins informed the Commission that this was a General Plan inconsistency dating back to the 1994 General Plan and was just a clean up item.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Comer, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Norton, **TO APPROVE** staff's recommendation for Area P as outlined in the staff report.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Maloney, Norton, Singletary,
NOES: None
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Item 10 – Area Q

Chair Leonard said that when the Citizen's Advisory Committee looked at the area is along the 91 Freeway, what it was looking at was not so much the existing businesses but the emerging dynamics of the interchange. He circulated a photo simulation of the freeway in its completed form. This is what the committee reviewed in terms of appearance and how land uses would appear from public rights of way. Two issues that came up, which he supported fully, one was the need for the downtown corridor to grow outside the corridor for highrise buildings. So far, there is only one building that meets this criteria on Spruce and Chicago. There has been no area designated for those types of uses where there is freeway access and visibility. The flip side of this is, there existing are uses there that want to be legalized but they are users such as an auto wrecking yard, mattress factory and a number of other things that are in a concentrated public view.

Commissioner Comer illustrated an example of the freeway interchange going through. On the aerial photograph, there is a business park that has recently been sold and a design review application has been submitted. Since the first of the year we have put in national retail type tenants in those business parks that are capitalizing on the freeway identity. By rezoning it to the office park it is in conflict with what he sees. He stated he doesn't see it as an office location. He sees it as freeway showrooms and freeway oriented businesses.

Chair Leonard replied fair enough, but did he see it as different from the way it has emerged to date.

Commissioner Comer explained that it is emerging right now and the current M-2 Zoning designation allows it to continue to emerge and allows freeway visibility for retail sales. He commented that he does not foresee someone putting in a five-story office tower in that area anytime in the near future.

Chair Leonard clarified that he thought there were two recommendations in this area but the exhibit doesn't show it. He asked staff if there was an exhibit that showed Q-1 and Q-2.

Ms. Jenkins replied that she did not have an exhibit with both sites but showed the separate slides for the areas. She stated that both Q-1 and Q-2 were proposed for the Office designation but are now being broken down into pieces.

Chair Leonard stated that the Commission could vote on these sites separately or together.

Commissioner Comer stated that he did not see that the designation of Office would be inappropriate either. He realized this is the 2025 vision but pointed out that the Zoning Ordinance will start rezoning people's properties. He stated that it is really going to have a detrimental effect, not in terms financial implications but in terms of blight where you render people's properties unusable.

Commissioner Kurani stated he agreed with Commissioner Comer. He stated that he did not know how Office would fit in, especially in Area Q-1.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Comer, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Densmore, **TO DENY** staff's recommendation for Area Q-1 and Q-2 as outlined in the staff report and apply the I-Industrial designation instead.

MOTION FAILED by a vote of 4 ayes to 4 noes and 0 disqualified and 0 abstentions.

AYES:	Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Singletary
NOES:	Brown, Maloney, Leonard, Norton
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	None
ABSENT:	Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Chair Leonard stated the Commission could re-evaluate the areas again separately. He asked whether Q-1 was the area where the City Council just denied the indoor motor cross raceway proposal. He asked what the reasoning for this was.

Craig Aaron, Principal Planner, stated that the reason was that it was inconsistent with current Redevelopment Agency efforts to promote higher quality office and industrial uses in the area.

Ken Gutierrez, Planning Director, offered an alternative as a compromise, staff had recommended the O-Office as Chair Leonard stated. The Chambers of Commerce also supported the O-Office. One compromise between this and the motion that failed to pass is the Business Office Park designation which would allow for higher quality office and industrial uses consistent with the Council intent as stated by Mr. Aaron.

Commissioner Maloney stated that Mr. Gutierrez already answered his question and felt this was definitely the direction they should go. He indicated that on Vine there is a brand new 4-5 story office

building and it is heading that direction. He thought it would be a great location for offices and visibility and did not agree with the Industrial designation. He thought this was a good alternative.

Commissioner Densmore asked which designation would allow flexible growth in either direction, Business Office Park or Industrial?

Mr. Gutierrez replied that either one had certain flexibility but the Business Office Park has higher quality standards attributed to it. You will see more offices in a Business Office Park designation than you will an Industrial designation. If the Commission wants flexibility to go towards the showroom use, the Business Office Park would allow either the office or showroom.

Commissioner Brown stated that they went through this discussion two years ago at the Citizen's Advisory Committee. Their primary concern at that time, which still exists today, is to remove the blight. How they get rid of it appears at odds here. If Mr. Gutierrez' idea presents the most flexibility in doing that, than it behooves them to seriously consider the suggestion.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Comer, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Densmore, **TO DENY** staff's recommendation for Area Q-1 and apply the Business Office Park designation instead.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Maloney, Norton, Singletary
NOES:
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Comer, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Densmore, **TO APPROVE** staff's recommendation for Area Q-2 and apply the I-Industrial designation.

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 7 ayes to 1 no and 0 disqualified and 0 abstentions.

AYES: Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Maloney, Norton Singletary
NOES: Leonard
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Item 10 – Area R

Chair Leonard read the proposal.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Kurani, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Maloney, **TO APPROVE** staff's recommendation for Area R and apply the Mixed-Use Urban designation.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Maloney, Leonard, Norton, Singletary

NOES: None
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Item 10 – Area S

Chair Leonard read the proposal.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Comer, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Kurani, **TO APPROVE** staff's recommendation for Area S as outlined in the staff report.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Maloney, Leonard, Norton Singletary
NOES: None
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Item 10 – Area T

Chair Leonard read the proposal.

Ms. Jenkins said that the text of the report mistakenly only indicates Mixed-Use Village, it should be Mixed-Use Village and High Density Residential.

Mr. Aaron informed the Commission that staff has had further discussions with the property owner and staff is now suggesting that the entire property be Mixed-Use Village.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Kurani, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Singletary, **TO APPROVE** staff's recommendation for Area T, for all of the subject property, Mixed-Use Village, as corrected by staff..

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Maloney, Leonard, Norton Singletary
NOES: None
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Item 10 – Area U, 1145 Everton Pl.

Chair Leonard read the proposal.

Ms. Jenkins stated that this was brought to staff's attention by the Chambers of Commerce. This property is owned by UCR and was mistakenly shown as High Density Residential under the current General Plan and should be Public Facilities because it is UCR property.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Kurani, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Norton, **TO APPROVE** staff's recommendation for Area U for all of the subject property.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES:	Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Maloney, Leonard, Norton Singletary
NOES:	None
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	None
ABSENT:	Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Item 10 – Area V

Chair Leonard read the proposal.

Ms. Jenkins stated that there was a mistake in the staff report and staff's recommendation is just for Mixed-Use Urban.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Brown, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Singletary, **TO APPROVE** staff's recommendation for Area V and designate the area Mixed-Use Urban as corrected by staff.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES:	Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Maloney, Leonard, Norton Singletary
NOES:	None
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	None
ABSENT:	Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Item 11 – Area W

Chair Leonard read the proposal.

Commissioner Comer commented that there are currently numerous auto repair shops. It seems to be much more akin to leaving it something that would be able to associate uses and manufacturers in the M-1 Zoning in some fashion. He suggested the I-Industrial.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Comer, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Singletary, **TO DENY** staff's recommendation for Area W and designate the area I-Industrial instead.

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 5 ayes to 3 noes and 0 disqualified and 0 abstentions.

AYES:	Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Singletary
NOES:	Brown, Maloney, Norton
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	None
ABSENT:	Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Item 11 – Site Y

Chair Leonard read the proposal.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Kurani, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Singletary, **TO DENY** staff's recommendation for Area Y and designate the area I-Industrial instead.

Commissioner Norton inquired whether the property owner had agreed to abide by the setbacks in accordance to the BMP Zone. She asked if it would be appropriate to apply this at this time since the property owner agreed to this.

Ms. Jenkins replied affirmatively. In the letter from Grisham and Nolan, representing Mr. Pope, he is requesting the I General Plan designation but is agreeable to maintaining the setbacks of the proposed BMP Zone so that he would be consistent with his neighbors yet have the flexibility to do the type of use he is currently doing. She stated that applying the setbacks would be done as part of the Commission's review of the Zoning Code.

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 7 ayes to 1 no and 0 disqualified and 0 abstentions.

AYES:	Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Norton, Singletary
NOES:	Maloney
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	None
ABSENT:	Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Item 11 – Site Z

Chair Leonard read the proposal.

Ms. Jenkins stated that in his letters, the property owner, Mr. Nearman, indicates he is agreeable with the proposed Mixed-Use Village but there is a letter from Cal-Baptist indicating that they would recommend Mixed-Use Urban on this site.

Chair Leonard commented that the site was private property but was heavily influenced by the University. He felt that the site was qualified for Mixed-Use Urban.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Comer, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Brown, **TO DENY** staff's recommendation for Area Z and apply the Mixed-Use Urban designation instead.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Maloney, Leonard, Norton, Singletary
NOES: None
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Item 11 – Area AA

Chair Leonard read the proposal.

Commissioner Comer asked staff to address whether aerospace uses could continue under the Business Office Park designation.

Ms. Jenkins stated that under the proposed Zoning Code the BMP Zone would be the implementing Zone for the Business Office Park General Plan designation. She stated that manufacturing of anything, aerospace or otherwise, is a permitted use in the Business Office Park.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Comer, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Maloney, **TO APPROVE** staff's recommendation for Area AA as outlined in the staff report.

Commissioner Densmore noted that staff's recommendation split the site and that the eastern 15 acres were BMP and the remainder was Industrial.

Chair Leonard asked if both those Zones were allowed under the General Plan category?

Ms. Jenkins replied that if the General Plan category remains BOP across the entire property, the implementing Zone would only be the BMP Zone. As a Charter City, Riverside can have inconsistencies between the Zoning and General Plan. The Commission may still recommend the I-Industrial Zone.

Mr. Aaron also indicated that the text of the BMP Implementing Zone could also be changed to include aerospace manufacturing. This could be done when the Commission reviews the Zoning Code.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Maloney, Leonard, Norton, Singletary
NOES: None
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Item 11 – Area AAA, 3735 & 3739 Nelson Street and 6781 & 6789 Brockton Avenue

Chair Leonard read the proposal and noted that this was a correction to a mapping error.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Norton, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Singletary, **TO APPROVE** staff's recommendation for Area AAA for all of the subject property as outlined in the staff report.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES:	Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Maloney, Leonard, Norton, Singletary
NOES:	None
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	None
ABSENT:	Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Item 12

Ms. Jenkins explained staff's request to apply the appropriate General Plan designation once the new General Plan adopts to any current General Plan Amendment which has been approved within the last year or an Annexation underway.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Brown, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Norton, **TO APPROVE** staff's policy recommendation as outlined in the staff report.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES:	Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Maloney, Leonard, Norton, Singletary
NOES:	None
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	None
ABSENT:	Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Item 13

Ms. Jenkins said this policy applied to the R-2 properties at Mt. Vernon, Madison and San Rafael. She explained that the policy recommended lot consolidation of 1 acre or larger for future development. In the Zoning Code review, the Commission will see this area is proposed for the R-3-4000 Zone.

Chair Leonard said he had brought this up on an earlier site on Van Buren where there were long lots being redesignated for higher density residential. He asked why everything wasn't being captured in this policy for 1 acre minimum versus one at a time.

Ms. Jenkins replied that the new Zoning Code is proposing a 1 acre lot size minimum for R-3 Zoning.

Mr. Aaron added that these were existing legal lots that did not meet the requirements. If the City does not have this policy, then each individual lot could be developed with a small apartment.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Norton, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Kurani, **TO APPROVE** staff's policy recommendation as outlined in the staff report.

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 4 ayes to 4 noes and 0 disqualified and 0 abstentions.

AYES: Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Maloney, Leonard, Norton, Singletary
NOES: None
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Item 14

Ms. Jenkins stated that this was in regard to the high density residential along Magnolia Avenue. This is CAC site 16, proposed for high density residential. Staff wanted to ensure that these properties have meaningful development, sensitive to the surrounding land uses in these areas. She stated that the Chambers of Commerce recommended that the area be put into high residential.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Norton, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Brown, **TO APPROVE** staff's recommendation as outlined in the staff report.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Maloney, Leonard, Norton, Singletary
NOES: None
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Item 15

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Densmore, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Norton, **TO APPROVE** staff's recommendation as outlined in the staff report.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Maloney, Norton, Singletary
NOES: None
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Item 16

Chair Leonard expressed his concern regarding the specific plans and annexations into the area. He felt that the specific plans should include language regarding the annexed areas. This does not preclude the City's ability to require amendments to the plans, but the sphere area should also strive to maintain consistency with the County's General Plan.

Ms. Jenkins responded that this would be part of an implementation tool. This item is actually talking about the change in the sphere size. The planning area in the General Plan originally reduced the sphere to the Cajalco Ridge. As the General Plan process progressed, it was decided to leave the sphere as it was approved in 1998.

Chair Leonard noted that his comments would still apply. He also expressed his concern with regard to the EIR.

Ms. Jenkins explained that because the larger sphere boundary was part of the 1998 review and there are no proposed changes, there was no need to address it in the EIR.

Commissioner Brown said that staff was aware of his concerns with regard to the relationship between the County and the City and asked if this would affect what he would try to do in the Implementation Plan.

Ms. Jenkins responded that it would not affect his intentions.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Norton, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Brown, **TO APPROVE** staff's recommendation as outlined in the staff report.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES:	Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Maloney, Norton, Singletary
NOES:	None
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	None
ABSENT:	Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Item 17

Ms. Jenkins stated that staff is recommending a Zoning/General Plan consistency matrix. The purpose of the matrix is to coordinate the General Plan designations with the proposed Zoning Code designations. This would depict which zones are consistent with which General Plan designations.

Commissioner Densmore commented that since the Commission will be discussing the Zones and the need for changes, it may be better to return to this item at a later time. The assumption is that some of these zones will be adopted when they might not be. If the Commission were to vote on the matrix, he would want it understood that changes may need to be made based on their actions on the Zoning Code.

Mr. Aaron clarified that what staff is suggesting is something to actually add as part of the General Plan when it is adopted. Staff is proposing a concept of what should be on the matrix but once the Commission makes their decisions the matrix will be changed to reflect those changes.

Commissioner Brown stated he wished to commend staff on this. The Citizen's Advisory Committee made several favorable comments toward the staff during the development of this document. Yes, it is a floating document and it should be updated as the occasion calls for.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Brown, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Norton, **TO APPROVE** staff's recommendation as outlined in the staff report.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES:	Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Maloney, Norton, Singletary
NOES:	None
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	None
ABSENT:	Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Circulation and Community Mobility Element

Item 18-26

Chair Leonard noted that because there are a large number of tasks, a lot of these are clean up items. He proposed to open all of the Element for discussion and then vote on each item. He asked if an exhibit of Item 18, Master Plan of Roadways to identify the streets proposed as parkways in the Riverside Park Plan was available.

Ms. Jenkins stated that she did not have the Riverside Park Map, it was in the General Plan but not a part of this presentation.

Chair Leonard asked Commissioner Brown if this was an item that has been a concern. This focus is on parkways not trails.

Commissioner Brown stated he didn't care where it was put in, but he does have strong views on this.

Chair Leonard stated that since this didn't specifically deal with trails, he would continue with other items.

He noted that item 19 has a list of additions to the Circulation Element. He suggested adding a recommendation for Central Avenue to connect to Fairview with traffic calming devices as reasonable along Fairview. This acknowledges item #23 which indicates that the Citizens Advisory Committee, Washington Alessandro Committee, and every committee that has been appointed and spent time reviewing this issue has recommended that extension. That extension has developed into a more critical need over the recent years not only because of the congestion at the intersection, but on the west side of the Chicago / Arlington link, there is no way in or out, all of the streets dead end. That could be remedied by the connection of Central Avenue

Commissioner Brown said, for the benefit of the people in the audience, that this situation has been going on since the 70's. This same recommendation was also tried in the 80's and in both cases was turned down. During the course of the CAC, two years ago, they asked for a special traffic study to be conducted to determine the feasibility of connecting Chicago, Fairfield and Central which revealed that

it would relieve the congestion of Arlington, Chicago and Alessandro. He said he had strong feelings about this and that while it may have had merit back in the 70's and 80's, a City of this size and predominance almost dictates that this be done. He also added that with the new construction going on at the intersection of Central and Chicago and further toward 60/215, it is even more paramount that this happen. He hoped everyone was listening because to him this is one of the significant things that will come out of this General Plan that has to be done.

Commissioner Norton commented with regard to the Overlook Parkway connection. She stated that she understood this had been pulled off and assigned a task force to study the feasibility of opening that pending finding a way through the neighborhood.

Ms. Jenkins explained that Overlook Parkway is part of the Circulation Element, it was in 1994 and is still there today. It is proposed as a 120' arterial but will be developed as two lanes as it crosses the bridge, maintaining the right-of-way. There is a policy in the General Plan that recommends a specific plan level study prior to the connection of Overlook that will indicate how the traffic will get from Overlook to the 91 Freeway and that that connection be made to the 91 freeway prior to the connection at the bridge over the Arroyo.

Chair Leonard said that with regard to Chicago, it is his understanding that this has a history of decisions made for the day not the future. One of those decisions made is that there is now a house within the alignment. The property would have to be acquired and demolished but in his mind it is important to do this. If there was anything they do in the Circulation Element of any significance, he felt this was it.

Commissioner Brown agreed and added that it was about time the City realized that laws were made for the masses not the classes. He felt that the City has grown to the point where they have to think about the majority rather than the minority. As indicated, even if that house has to come down, it is necessary.

Commissioner Norton inquired if it was the Chair's intent to have a motion regarding the Circulation Community Mobility Element.

Chair Leonard replied that his intent was for all items just discussed 18-26.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Norton, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Brown, **TO APPROVE** items 18-26 as outlined in the staff report with the addition of the items discussed by the Commissioners as indicated.

Chair Leonard recalled there were one or two comments that came up during the public testimony they heard, both of them were in support of the connection.

Mr. Aaron clarified for Commissioner Kurani that the item he brought up regarding Arlington Avenue as a parkway was covered under LU-2 last week and also under item 18 tonight, so that it is in there.

Chair Leonard clarified the motion. He pointed out that items 23-26 were actually items where no recommendation is taken. The Commission is taking action on items 18-22 with the amendment to 19 to include the Central/Chicago connection.

Mr. Gutierrez clarified that staff recommended no change to this section and that what is in the Plan should stay. Staff did not recommend that the Central Avenue extension not be approved at this time and felt that their conversation on the subject was good. If the Commission wishes to proceed with this

recommendation, perhaps it should be in the form of an Implementation Measure to be taken up separately rather than at this time. He indicated that because the extension would affect many people, it would warrant a hearing on its own merit.

Commissioner Densmore noted that regardless of what they did tonight, assuming it was adopted as part of the recommendation, this would still proceed to Council. He could not imagine that this would preclude a hearing for something this important.

Mr. Gutierrez agreed. The Commission's recommendations will be passed on to the City Council in totality. The City Council will consider all of the recommendations at an advertised public hearing. The Council could take action to support the Commission's recommendation or not, or they could table this item and have a separate hearing.

Commissioner Densmore added that should the Council approve their recommendation, when it came time for this particular matter to be implemented, he would imagine it would be subject of a separate hearing at that particular point in time.

Mr. Gutierrez pointed out that once it is on the General Plan it is an approved street. As developments occur, conditions may be added that the street be built or that land be dedicated for the construction of the street. What is in the General Plan will be implemented either through ministerial acts or through capital improvement programs, etc. Some of these actions could require public hearings, depending upon what it is.

Commissioner Densmore asked what staff's recommendation was, to take no action or take action and flag it for public hearings so that the City Council will see it?

Commissioner Norton noted that other connections have been sent to a task force and are still out there. She would like to send this forward and see what happens.

Commissioner Brown agreed with Commissioner Norton. This has been studied to death like other things in the City and nothing ever happens. He encouraged the Commissioners to support this and put it through in bold print all the way.

Commissioner Densmore agreed in part and stated he would vote for the motion. He wanted to be sensitive to what Mr. Gutierrez had stated and at least flag the item. This is one of those items where the whole neighborhood will want to say something when it comes up. He did not want this to go forward as having been overlooked.

Chair Leonard commented that it all starts with a line on a map and the Commission is trying to get that line on the map. It will be up to the City Council to agree. It is a separate process of an environmental review for the street to come forward subject to a public hearing.

Commissioner Norton stated that her point is that the public will still have their hearings, this is not something that will happen tomorrow.

Chair Leonard indicated that there were no comments on the balance of this Element.

Commissioner Brown asked Ms. Smith how to ensure that this issue is flagged.

Ms. Smith replied that it is a policy call for the Commission. She felt that the Commission's discussion and staff's report will point it out that this is a recommendation coming from the Planning Commission. There will be plenty of opportunities to have further discussion on this.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES:	Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Maloney, Norton, Singletary
NOES:	None
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	None
ABSENT:	Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Housing Element

Item 27

Chair Leonard noted that there is one Implementation tool recommended under the Housing Element which is to place a greater emphasis on senior housing.

Commissioner Densmore said he had no problem with senior housing but his concern was that this General Plan will be around for quite some time. Senior housing is given slightly different considerations when it comes before the Commission on a day to day basis. He felt that more developers would come forward looking for the flexibility of senior housing because of this emphasis in the General Plan and at some point in time Riverside may have more senior housing than needed.

Chair Leonard recalled that because of the Riverside International Raceway there was a high demand for motels. The motels sprouted up and down University Avenue and are now being replaced by student housing. Perhaps one day student housing will be replaced as the uses last a long time, but are not necessarily permanent. He asked if Commissioner Densmore had any wording to suggest.

Commissioner Densmore commented that senior housing was good but that the considerations given and benchmarks to which they are held should be as high as possible to affect a balance between senior housing that will also be compatible with future uses which may not necessarily be senior housing. He reiterated that he was not against senior housing but against some considerations given to senior housing that would not be given to other types of developments. He suggested including wording to place a greater emphasis on high quality senior housing which would meet additional housing needs in the future.

Mr. Gutierrez stated that he had no objection to that language. He noted that what the Commission did not see in this recommendation was a booklet by the Senior Housing Task Force. The report does speak to quality senior housing and a variety of senior housing, not just low income or affordable housing. The other issue it speaks to is that Riverside is woefully inadequate in terms of providing housing for seniors. The task force report is really a policy directive to supply housing to meet the varied and diverse needs of seniors, whether it be apartments, living centers or single family homes. Staff is referring to this report which has those policies and the language suggested by Commissioner Densmore is very consistent with that report.

Commissioner Densmore stated that he would like to request that they add the term “high quality”, so that the standards are not lowered just to provide a type of housing.

Chair Leonard inquired why the policy could not reference the report it is based on? He noted that people like to build density projects under the guise of senior housing.

Mr. Gutierrez agreed.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Comer, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Densmore, **TO APPROVE** Items 27-29 of the Housing Element as outlined in the staff report and revised by the Commission.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES:	Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Maloney, Norton, Singletary
NOES:	None
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	None
ABSENT:	Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Arts & Culture Element

Item 30-31

Chair Leonard stated that with regard to item 31, the Chamber of Commerce raised concern about a percentage fee for the arts funded by development fees. He said that he would share the Chamber’s concern on this.

Commissioner Densmore applauded the Chamber for coming up with a mechanism but questioned them at the time whether this was the best they could do. The developers are being asked to pay a lot of fees and he wanted to make sure that the Chamber had given consideration for other ways in which the Chamber itself or businesses in general could also help fund this. He was in agreement with the recommendation that there be innovative ways to raise funds, but not necessarily just developers.

Commissioner Norton agreed and added that there are things taking place and being talked about to move this forward. She was sure an Implementation Plan would be along soon.

Mr. Gutierrez referred the Commission to the specific policy, page AC-21, 4.28 . He read the section “explore opportunities for long term funding the arts for example consider various types of city fees as a way to fund the arts”. If the Commission would like, they can remove the example and just leave it, “consider opportunities for long term funding”.

Commissioner Densmore stated that he had seen this section but was just responding to the Chair who was incorporating the Chambers letter. The Chambers letter simply said developers. He wanted to make sure they got back to the original tone which was to look at everything.

Mr. Gutierrez agreed and clarified that this was the way the policy read.

Chair Leonard stated it was understood and that at this point there didn't appear to be a change for the Arts & Culture section and unless there were any other comments they would continue as there was no action to take.

Ms. Jenkins explained that the Commission will be making a formal recommendation at the end of the report.

Education Element

Item 33

Chair Leonard noted that there were no recommended changes to the Education Element. He felt that the idea of having a greater dialogue between school districts and colleges with the City regarding their master plans should be suggested. This is probably more of an Implementation tool than a General Plan policy.

Commissioner Densmore said that the City should be encouraged to set up, if not already existing, some sort of a forum where the schools, city and citizen groups sit down on a regular basis. He asked if such a forum existed.

Ms. Jenkins informed the Commission that there is the Education Business Council meeting tomorrow at lunch time. It is made up of members from each of the colleges as well as the school districts and members of City staff to talk about various issues such as these.

Chair Leonard announced, for the audience's information, that they were pushing to have at least semi-annual meetings with each school district in a workshop format, to that they can share ideas, land use trends of the City and get an understanding of where they are intending to site school facilities in order to augment each other's efforts.

There were no recommended changes, the Commission continued with the next Element.

Public Safety Element

Item 34-35

Chair Leonard read the recommended changes.

Commissioner Brown asked whether the railroad grade separation should also be included in the Public Safety Element. He felt that it was an important enough issue to be in both places.

Mr. Gutierrez responded that if the Commission would like to add a reference in the Public Safety Element back to the Transportation Element where it is detailed, that it would be fine.

Commissioner Brown agreed.

Chair Leonard noted that this item was addressed last week. The policy says pursue separate grade separator rail crossings as the first level priority for reducing street and rail conflicts. The Commission

expanded this to include other forms of separations such as tunneling, realignments or other options that may be feasible, not just grade separation. He agreed that it was important and noted that it was also a Public Safety policy which was also repeated in the Noise Element and one or two other areas as per the Commission's action.

Commissioner Densmore added to include not only how it affects transportation and the accessibility of emergency vehicles, but also the transportation of hazardous materials through the town.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Comer, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Singletary, **TO APPROVE** the recommended changes as outlined in the staff report, items 34 and 35.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES:	Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Maloney, Norton, Singletary
NOES:	None
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	None
ABSENT:	Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Noise Element

Item 36-37

Chair Leonard noted that there was a recommended change (Item 36) to authorize modifications to figure N-8, Riverside and Flabob Airport noise contours based on studies that are currently in play. There is also an item recommending no change (Item 37) dealing with point source railroad noise being completed. This was in response to several of the Commissioner's comments which were also raised last week about the fact that noise is measured ambient over a 24 hour period when trains come through or other noise events on a more direct basis.

Commissioner Comer asked if something could be added to draw attention to this as a public nuisance.

Chair Leonard recalled that what they did at the last meeting was to seek a condition to recognize that the noise environment reflected in the noise study did not factor actual events during the course of a day but averaged it throughout the day. He did not believe it got that far.

Commissioner Densmore said that the point had been made more than once by several citizens, more recently by Mary Humbolt, that there are a certain number of trains going through at this point in time but there will be more in the future. The point was made by Commissioner Comer more than once that there can be a cacophony of noises which have a tendency to drown out the trains during the day but in the middle of the night, to say that they can be heard a certain space away from the railroad tracks and not across town is silly. It needs to be recognized that if it is bad now it will get worse and it should be to measured on a 24 hour period not just at some point in the day.

Chair Leonard pointed out that the Commission does not like the way the noise study was done but that this is the way it is done universally.

Commissioner Comer suggested that the noise be measured at the point when the horns are blown as the noise levels are substantially beyond the contour lines indicated. Something should be added that doesn't draw the burden upon the residents of the City of Riverside to correct the problem because it is not something that through further development is going to be fixed and resolved. Staff had indicated that by doing some of these things, it would mean that every time someone built a house they would need to build a rail under pass which would not be appropriate.

Chair Leonard inquired how the Commission could include a General Plan policy?

Commissioner Densmore noted that the policy, N-4.2 on page N-32 simply says, "Investigate and pursue innovative approaches to reducing noise from railroad sources". This sort of covers it as long as the Commission's concerns are made a matter of record. I guess we are talking more of urgency because of the frequency of the trains and because of the fact that the Commission is not in agreement with the noise studies.

Mr. Aaron suggested that the Commission could include that policy as an implementation tool. Staff can research this more and do an analysis of other cities.

Chair Leonard suggested including an Implementation Tool to return in six months with options on the policy after the Plan is adopted.

Mr. Aaron agreed.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Comer, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Densmore, **TO APPROVE** the Noise Element and approve items 36 and 37 as outlined in the staff report. To include an implementation tool to return in six months, of the General Plan approval, with options with regard to policies for point source noise.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES:	Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Maloney, Norton, Singletary
NOES:	None
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	None
ABSENT:	Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Air Quality Element

Items 38-39

Chair Leonard read the recommended changes.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Comer, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Densmore, **TO APPROVE** the Air Quality Element, items 38-39 as outlined in the staff report.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES:	Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Maloney, Norton, Singletary
-------	--

NOES: None
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Open Space and Conservation Element

Items 40-42

Chair Leonard read the recommended changes.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Comer, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Singletary, **TO APPROVE** the Open Space and Conservation Element, items 40-42 as outlined in the staff report.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Maloney, Norton, Singletary
NOES: None
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Public Facilities and Infrastructure Element

Items 43-45

Chair Leonard read the recommended changes.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Comer, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Densmore, **TO APPROVE** the Public Facilities and Infrastructure Element, items 43-45 as outlined in the staff report.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Maloney, Norton, Singletary
NOES: None
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Park and Recreation Element

Items 46-48

Chair Leonard read the recommended changes.

Commissioner Densmore inquired whether the Commission received a letter or testimony requesting to not just limit the discussion of the arroyos to the six major arroyos but to all the tributaries to those arroyos. This was an attempt to include the arroyos and not overlook other land features.

Chair Leonard recalled that at the last hearing there were three individuals who spoke regarding washes being recognized in the General Plan. This policy only addresses Springbrook. He asked staff if there was a recommendation on this.

Ms. Jenkins suggested that the Commission consider an implementation tool under the Implementation Plan to revisit both the Open Space and Park and Recreation Elements as well as the Grading Ordinance to look at the arroyos and whether or not tributaries should be added.

Mr. Aaron added that a lot of comments provided to the Commission were good comments. Staff would like to include some of these comments in the Plan but the problem was that they were detailed and extensive comments which were submitted at a late date. Staff has not had the opportunity to analyze them and recommend that an implementation tool be added to provide the time to effectively analyze the comments.

Commissioner Densmore asked if staff had a similar policy to work with.

Mr. Gutierrez replied that there are several: policy OS-1-1, Protection of Reserve and Open Space and Natural Habitat, wherever possible work with Riverside County, adjacent City's, landowners, Conservation Agencies to preserve, protect and enhance open space. He said there were several other policies that deal with protecting the arroyos but are more general. He felt that Mr. Aaron's suggestion is a good one, if the Commission wants to add an implementation measure to revisit the grading and arroyo preservation ordinance.

Mr. Aaron agreed and noted that some suggestions that were made could specifically affect the Grading Ordinance. Staff needs time to review those and not rush into this.

Commissioner Brown sensed that they needed a higher priority for trails. As late as this afternoon, the Commission had another case with trail fragmentation. He felt very strongly that in the areas of Bradley, Overlook, Woodcrest and La Sierra they should have a firm policy and emphasis to ensure there is an integral trail system in this City. He didn't know if this would be in the form of an Ordinance but he would suggest strongly considering allocating one side of the street where applicable in all those areas to make sure there are connecting trails. Whatever can be done in the General Plan to bring this together and recognize that the City has a heritage in those particular areas and it should be accommodated. Someone will say that this will be cured when the person in Parks and Recreation Department is hired but he did not believe this was an answer. He solicited staff's assistance, assuming the rest of the Commission agreed with him.

Mr. Gutierrez stated that he believed that there were strong and solid policies in the General Plan that speak to Commissioner Brown's comments. There is a lot of work to do when it comes to trails but he did not believe it was a General Plan policy but one of implementation. They need to find ways to better implement the trails master plan, find ways to not only acquire the right-of-way but build the trail connecting those links. He said that he would strongly encourage the Commission to include an implementation measure dealing with trails, if the Plan did not already include such a measure.

Chair Leonard followed up on Commissioner Brown's point. He agreed that this was an implementation problem. The Commission sees trails on a project level, property by property and never sees the pieces coming together. In the instance today, there was someone dedicating the trail and posting bonds for the future construction of it. What is unknown is the trigger for that construction. What is enough of the trail linkage to build the trail and surely there must be other funding mechanism to fill in the links that need to complete the trail or specify distances. This is what seems to be lacking in the General Plan as a policy.

Commissioner Densmore felt that the words were there, but the key word Commissioner Brown was hitting on was integration. There are policies: 2.1 through 2.5 which refer to improving, creating and implementing the revisions to integrate public transportation routes when locating regional reserve parks and creating a primary trail loop.

Chair Leonard reiterated that item 47 speaks to that as well as at least getting a decent mapping plan in place to plot the trails. At a minimum, he felt they could add a policy to review trails at the project level for connectivity to the master plan trails.

Commissioner Maloney agreed and believed they should be doing something that Park and Recreation staff should be looking at.

Commissioner Brown suggested adding a turn in that if someone wants to make an addition to their home as part of the approval process they would need to go through Park and Recreation to connect the trails. This should apply to any development in areas where it is applicable: Bradley, Overlook and La Sierra. He also thought staff should consider changing the Ordinance so that one side of the street in all of those areas are set aside for possible trails. He had asked Public Works if it would cost more money to do this and was told it would be cheaper.

Mr. Gutierrez commented that he fully agreed with the idea of connectivity of the entire trails network for the City. There needs to be an implementation tool to get this on the ground and believed that the policies were already there. Another issue Commissioner Maloney brought up is an important consideration which is addressed somewhat in the General Plan which could be added to, policy CCM 10-10.8. This policy talks about maximizing links between trails and residential neighborhoods. Staff could add to it to include, "look for opportunities to connect to the trail system". This would really encourage staff when reviewing any kind of a plan, to look for those opportunities.

Commissioner Brown reiterated that if every development in those areas of concern were required to get this kind of a review, the problem would be solved.

Commissioner Norton asked if this placed the onus on the Planning or Parks and Recreation Departments and if it increased the burden for the developer? She also asked if it would slow the process down significantly.

Mr. Gutierrez replied affirmatively to all. He thought that there would have to be a learning curve transition period. When the Plan is in place the process may be slowed but it would only be for a while.

Commissioner Maloney wanted to make sure that not only a couple of areas were targeted, there is no reason it should not apply to each and every project that comes around. It should be the onus of the developer and Planning to look at it and say no or why not have a trail. The Commission received a

copy of the Walkable Communities, citizens should be able to walk everywhere, lets not limit it to an area.

Chair Leonard stated he was fully on board in terms of addressing this on a tract map stage but he was not in favor of placing this at a building permit stage to add a family room to the back of an existing home.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Norton, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Maloney, **TO APPROVE** the Park and Recreation Element, items 46-48 as outlined in the staff report.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES:	Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Maloney, Norton, Singletary
NOES:	None
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	None
ABSENT:	Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Chair Leonard wanted to ensure that these items would be captured in the minutes in terms of what they will come back and hit in the Implementation Plan.

Commissioner Brown noted that there were a lot of items deferred to the Implementation Plan. He hoped that there was a fool proof system so that none of the issues would be lost in the process.

Historic Preservation Element

There were no changes recommended for this Element.

Glossary

Item 49

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Norton, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Singletary, **TO APPROVE** the recommendations for the Glossary, item 49 as outlined in the staff report.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES:	Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Maloney, Norton, Singletary
NOES:	None
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	None
ABSENT:	Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Additional Items

Items 50-52

Chair Leonard asked Ms. Jenkins to go through the three additional items, 50-52 which were not in the staff report.

Ms. Jenkins stated that these items are not in the staff report, although the Commission may have heard about one of them when they were updated on the recent Council actions. The Van Buren Drive-in site's current General Plan designation is Other Recreation. This was rolled over into new staff proposal as Private Recreation. At this time staff is recommending the Commission consider Commercial and High Density Residential on the property. At the May 24, City Council hearing, the Council reviewed a project on this property and recommended the General Plan designation be Commercial and High Density Residential, subject to a project being submitted. Staff recommends that there be a policy or additional language added that the line between the Commercial and High Density Residential be a fluid line subject to a proposal that would actually build out the commercial and high density residential.

Commissioner Norton asked if High Density Residential would possibly mean apartments.

Ms. Jenkins replied affirmatively.

Commissioner Comer noted that the newspaper speculated regarding a big box retail type project for this site. Would the General Plan need to be revised on the High Density Residential portion of this project?

Ms. Jenkins explained that staff is recommending that the line between the Commercial and High Density Residential be a fluid line subject to a proposal.

Commissioner Comer asked what would happen if the commercial or residential element were deleted.

Mr. Gutierrez stated that under this recommendation you could not eliminate one or the other, it is both. This is a large site a big box retailer most likely would build commercial on the front with residential on the back. This is why staff is making this recommendation. The Commission has approved a General Plan designation in the past that shows Commercial along the Van Buren frontage and residential behind it. This proposal is not inconsistent with a previous approval and it is consistent with the City Council action of three weeks ago.

Commissioner Kurani asked why the Mixed Use Urban designation could not be applied to this site. This would eliminate the need for a fluid line.

Mr. Gutierrez explained that the Mixed Use Urban would not allow all of the commercial uses they were looking for, especially the large box mentioned earlier. The intent of Mixed Use Urban is to create the symbiotic relationship between the residential and commercial where you live upstairs and walk downstairs or next door. This would be a little more difficult of a sell. This also provides for higher density residential and less open space because the theory is you are using the open space part of the commercial project that becomes your playground and that is not necessarily the case here, plus it is also inconsistent with the Council action.

Commissioner Densmore expressed his concern that the public hearing was closed and staff is asking the Commission to address an extremely sensitive item that really wasn't open to public comment. The concern is, as the Commission expressed this morning, that it really wasn't a class act to pull the rug out from under the developer who is coming in with a very successful project and had gone through several hoops to make the project successful. He understood the recommendation is going to Council for ultimate consideration and thought that it begged the question of due process. The original General Plan recommendation from the department was not what he saw before him. This was also not what was put before the public so that they could comment on whether or not this was a great idea, correct? He stated

he was not comfortable with taking this up at this point without reopening that point to see what people have to say.

Mr. Gutierrez clarified that this was a recommendation and that the Commission can use their best judgment. Staff's reasoning is that this is consistent with a recent Council action that just took place. Secondly, the Commission just approved item 12 that referred to any General Plan amendments in the process to be adopted would be allowed to go forward. He stated that there is action on this property to do exactly as staff has explained, the only difference is the fluidity of that line.

Commissioner Densmore said that this reminded him of the neighborhood that made the news. He saw a glimmer of how some of these things get on the table and that this was circumventing the process. He stated that he was not inclined to take this direction at this time. If the City Council wants to change it, that is always their prerogative.

Commissioner Comer asked what the current General Plan called for in this area.

Ms. Jenkins responded that the current General Plan is PKO which is Other Recreation.

Commissioner Comer referred to the John Husing Report regarding encouraging more business and office parks in the community for job creation. He asked if anybody looked at a global picture of this site, in a perfect world what would they like to see there.

Mr. Gutierrez explained that staff did look at the entire Van Buren frontage. This is an important area from Lincoln to the freeway and was looked at very carefully. He noted that the area above it is Industrial Business Park and staff did look at bringing this down further south to include the drive-in theater site. As previously mentioned, it was not recommended because there was a recent Planning Commission and City Council action on the property to go Commercial and Residential. Staff knew this was pending and left it alone.

Commissioner Norton stated that there were public hearings before the Planning Commission and City Council. There were a lot of public hearings and the City Council has taken action on it. If perhaps, they were not so involved in this issue, the Commission may be looking at this as a housekeeping issue of making something match as in other situations. The Commission may be over thinking this simply because they are involved in it.

Chair Leonard stated that his only argument with Commissioner Densmore's comments was that he thought he was rather mild. The only action the Council took was to deny a case. This is something else very similar to Riverside Avenue, late in the game and maybe not too well thought out. His vote will be to keep it PKO. They are dealing with a lot of hopes on some people's part on an application that hasn't been filed and involving an applicant that has already dropped out once.

Commissioner Norton inquired if they leave it PKO would an applicant have to request a General Plan Amendment and Zoning change.

Mr. Gutierrez confirmed but pointed out that there already is a General Plan and Zoning change that has been tentatively approved on this site for Commercial on the front and Residential on the back. If somebody came in with that project, they would not need a General Plan or Zone change as it has already been approved. He clarified that the City Council took no action on the General Plan and Rezoning and the reason for this was because there is a current approved General Plan Amendment and

Rezoning case to put commercial on the front and residential on the back. The Council member making the motion only added that the line remain fluid.

Commissioner Densmore noted that what Mr. Gutierrez referred to is an application that has been submitted under the current General Plan that is proceeding through and will not necessarily come before the Commission.

Mr. Gutierrez clarified that the application has already been reviewed and approved by the Commission.

Commissioner Densmore stated that his concern is not whether they were involved in that particular plan but the process. To send a message, he felt that it is ultimately the Council's decision. His concern is that they are being asked to buy off on something that he is uncomfortable about.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Densmore, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Comer, **TO RETAIN** under the proposed General Plan the PKO designation for site 50.

Commissioner Kurani stated that he had mixed feelings his concerns were mainly the process and traffic.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES:	Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Maloney, Norton, Singletary
NOES:	None
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	None
ABSENT:	Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Ms. Jenkins informed the Commission that the next sites for review are areas that are generally under City control. They are City owned properties and it is recommended that they be included in the General Plan as proposed Specific Plan areas. Site 51 is the area off of Tequesquite, against the river and is currently PKO and Natural Open Space. The existing Zoning is Official Zoning and the proposal is for it to be outlined as a specific plan. This will let the public know that the City is considering a specific plan for the City owned land. There is also a proposal to change the General Plan designation currently under the Open Space designation to the PR, Private Recreation designation.

Commissioner Comer stated that he did not have a problem with what they were doing but it should be noted that a large percentage of the land is not under control or owned by the City of Riverside. He indicated that Mr. Saavy owns property from Tequesquite to the bluff. The long pointy piece at the top is the old golf cart course owned by Golf Enterprising. Staff's statements are not correct and it needs to be made clear that a large percentage of the land is in private hands.

Mr. Gutierrez agreed with Commissioner Comer. He stated that it was important for the public to understand that there is a proposal coming forward and that there could be a change on this property by including the Specific Plan Overlay Zone on it. It lets anyone looking at this Plan know that it is intended to be a Specific Plan area. The one physical change Ms. Jenkins mentioned is important because the area that had been designated as Natural Open Space is a land fill which is hardly natural open space. He felt that to put this into Private Recreational makes sense.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Comer, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Maloney, **TO APPROVE** staff's recommendations for item 51.

Commissioner Densmore stated that he was not necessarily against the General Plan designation but questioned the process. In this particular case, he felt they were circumventing about half the process when staff introduces recommendations after the public hearing portion has been closed.

Mr. Gutierrez stated that he felt it was important that he respond a little bit in terms of the philosophy. He agreed with Commissioner Densmore that they do not want to bring in something late in the process that will try to circumvent public comment. This case and the other case, he puts in the category of notifying the public of changes being made. In the last item the Commission took up, staff is notifying the public that an existing General Plan and Zoning case has been approved on the site and lets them know that there is a change coming. The same thing with this property, it can be left exactly the way it is but by including the Specific Plan Overlay, staff is sending a message that there is something coming down the pike. There is a plan coming and it will be subject to a Specific Plan. Staff's intent in bringing this forward is in the interest of public notification.

Chair Leonard added that these are the designations that are shown on the General Plan recommended map except that the landfill is changed from Open Space to Private Recreation. The specific plan is an overlay.

Commissioner Densmore stated that if he abstained it would be a matter of principle.

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 7 ayes to 0 noes and 0 disqualified and 1 abstentions.

AYES:	Brown, Comer, Kurani, Leonard, Maloney, Norton, Singletary
NOES:	None
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	Densmore
ABSENT:	Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Ms. Jenkins informed the Commission that item 52 was similar to the previous site, a big portion of this property is also under City control. Part of the area proposed to be in the Specific Plan area is in the County and would be proposed for annexation in the future. Staff is not proposing any General Plan designation, only a specific plan boundary to indicate that if proposals are proposed in this area it will be through a specific plan process.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Maloney, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Comer, **TO APPROVE** staff's recommendations for a Specific Plan Overlay on site 52.

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 7 ayes to 0 noes and 0 disqualified and 1 abstentions.

AYES:	Brown, Comer, Kurani, Leonard, Maloney, Norton, Singletary
NOES:	None
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	Densmore
ABSENT:	Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Figure O - Comment Letters

Chair Leonard explained that these are comments made by individuals that didn't quite make it in terms of specific recommendations. He had two that he wanted to raise and asked if other Commissions had other letters they wanted to review.

Commissioner Kurani referred to a letter from Mr. Dillip, regarding property on Janet Avenue. The applicant was asking for High Density Residential. The reason he brings this up is that the applicant was looking for an infill project.

Mr. Aaron explained that this site was considered previously as part of the General Plan consistency program initiated to ensure that areas within single family areas did not become small apartment projects. The other similar property on Janet was developed as a low-income housing project. This was another site staff had recommended for R-1 Zoning as part of the General Plan consistency project.

Mr. Gutierrez added that one of the premises that the Citizen's Advisory Committee and Planning Commission had agreed to was to limit the ability to act on individual requests because those small parcels take a fair amount of research and public notification. He recalled that there was some discussion on this property before. To act on something like this without an analysis is difficult and staff recommends that the Commission take no action.

Chair Leonard asked if it was possible to go through other requests.

Mr. Gutierrez stated that if they are small individual requests for General Plan amendments, as a general rule staff recommends that the Commission not take action on them.

Chair Leonard stated that a proposal that was made which he felt had some legitimacy was the request made by Gary Horn & Associates for the Bank of America building in the Magnolia Center area. The designation is Mixed Use. The site seems to be an island in and of itself with commercial all around it. He felt this was a candidate for Mixed Use Urban. He asked what staff's feeling was in terms of considering that tonight.

Mr. Gutierrez stated that this was a change recommended by the Citizen's Advisory Committee. The Commission would be modifying the Citizen's Advisory Committee recommendation and would not be a new proposal. This is something that can be taken up. He indicated that a policy was introduced that would help Mr. Horn get to where he needed to be. The other issue is that anything on Magnolia Avenue will be given a closer review as part of the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan that will follow this process. Staff's recommendation on this would be to take that up as part of the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan.

Chair Leonard agreed. He said that another concern was a letter from Giardinelli, Duke & Simmons regarding the Board of Realtor's Office. He did not agree with the recommendation they made with regard to two parcels being Mixed Use Village which is up for Mixed Use Neighborhood as proposed. He could see Mixed Use Village as being a logical transition from the commercial along Magnolia to the commercial uses on Elizabeth and to the residential behind it. He asked what latitude there was to consider this?

Mr. Gutierrez stated that this was within the Commission's purview because it is an item before the Commission, they would just be modifying a recommendation.

Chair Leonard explained that the reasoning behind that is that the Board of Realtors has indicated a plan to vacate their existing office and build a new one on a parking lot. The businesses along Elizabeth are two story anyway so there is a degree of intensity that is already there. He thought that it would be best to address this through Mixed Use Village.

MOTION MADE by Chair Leonard, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Densmore, **TO APPROVE** the Mixed Use Village designation for the site indicated on the letter from Giardinelli, Duke & Simmons on Elizabeth Street.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES:	Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Maloney, Norton, Singletary
NOES:	None
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	None
ABSENT:	Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Land Use & Urban Design Element

Items 2-9

Chair Leonard stated he would like to add item 9b to authorize staff to monitor the implementation of the General Plan 2025 and initiate up to four quarterly General Plan amendments to correct errors in the Land Use Plan as they become known.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Comer, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Norton, **TO APPROVE** Items 2-9 as outlined in the staff report and the addition of item 9b To authorize staff to monitor the implementation of the General Plan 2025 and initiate up to four quarterly General Plan Amendments to correct errors in the Land Use Plan as they become known.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES:	Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Maloney, Norton, Singletary
NOES:	None
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	None
ABSENT:	Agnew, Sebelia, Stephens

Public Comments

Chair Leonard announced that the public comment period will be opened. The public may comment on anything that is within the purview of the Planning Commission.

He announced that now that the Planning Commission has adopted the General Plan the next hearing will be on the Zoning Code. The meeting on the Zoning Code will begin with public testimony so that the public will have another opportunity to comment.

Mr. Aaron informed the Commission that the advertisement placed in the newspaper specify the order that these items will be taken up. The next item will be the Subdivision Code, Design Guidelines, Zoning Code and the Implementation Plan. He suggested that the Commission continue with this order because this is what has been advertised.

Commissioner Norton stated that she will assume anything that they have voted for in the General Plan will be reflected in all the proper places in the EIR, or wherever they may apply.

Mr. Jenkins replied yes.

Mary Humbolt, 7407 Dufferin Avenue, stated that she has been coming to these hearings for a year. She is confused and did not understand the process. She did not understand the urgency to rush through now and deny the public access to comment. She felt that it was important at the beginning of each meeting to tell the public what the process is, what is to be discussed, and have agendas available for the public. It should be made clear to the public how they could participate in this process; but it is rather the opposite. With regard to the Noise Element, when DHL starts up there will be seven flights between 10:00 pm – 5:00 am. The noise will be affecting many of the Riverside neighborhoods. This is in addition to the flights taking place during the day. She stated that she did not see any reference to the airport noise. Secondly, Overlook Parkway and Central extensions, she stated that she did speak against these at the CAC meetings. The Overlook Parkway will be the destruction of the Riverside Greenbelt and Victoria Avenue and is in violation of Proposition R. The Central Avenue extension is an awful idea because it will take the park land away and destroy a beautiful neighborhood in Riverside. Last of all the Tequesquite Arroyo project is being shopped right now by a developer. The developer is proposing 650 and or golf course. This will mean the loss of 41 acres in park land for the City of Riverside. She also added that to simply state that the property will be developed with a golf course is not accurate because the developer is attaching 650 homes.

I. ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment to the June 23, 2005 meeting at 9:00 a.m. in the Art Pick Council Chambers.